Remarks:

The Examiner has rejected claims 10–35. Claims 1–9 were previously withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Claims 25 and 34 were previously canceled. Claims 10 and 23 are being amended to further recite the features of the invention; the scope of claims 10 and 23 remains unchanged. As a result, claims 10–24, 26–33, and 35 are pending for examination with claims 10 and 23 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 12–14, 16–23, and 26–33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al (US Publication No. 2007/0118670) ("Viswanath") in view of "Communicating Using Multiple Wireless Interfaces" by Kameswari Chebrolu et al. ("Chebrolu") and in further view of "Dynamic Parallel Access to Replicated Content in the Internet" by Pablo Rodriguez et al. ("Rodriguez") and in further view of Greer et al. (US Patent No. 5,978,828) ("Greer"). Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Chebrolu and in further view of Rodriguez and in further view of Greer and in further view of Boehm (US Publication No. 2004/0085944) ("Boehm"). Further, the Examiner has rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Chebrolu and in further view of Rodriguez and in further view of Greer and in further view of Nelson (US Publication No. 2003/0055975) ("Nelson"). Further, the Examiner has rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Chebrolu and in further view of Rodriguez and in further view of Greer and in further view of Holder (US Publication No. 2003/0208554) ("Holder"). Applicants traverse.

In particular, the Examiner argues that, "one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably interpret 'objects of a resource' as 'block of a document'." (OA, pg. 3, lines 15-17) Applicants traverse. Even so, the Examiner later goes on to contradict himself by equating Applicants' "objects in a virtual resource" to Chebrolu's "packet" (OA, pg. 6) and then immediately after goes on to once again contradict himself by equating Applicants' "objects in a virtual resource" to Rodriguez's "blocks" (OA, pg. 7). But obviously Applicants' "objects in a virtual resource" cannot be both "packets" and "blocks of a document" as these are clearly not the same thing. Further, while it may be the case, in arguendo, that an "object" can be represented in one or more "packet" for transmission over a network, clearly the "object" is not the same as the "packet". Even so, Applicants have amended claims 10 and 23 to further recite the features of the invention.

Applicants have amended independent **claim 10** to call for:

> "...determining a number of **objects in the virtual resource**;
> assigning each **object in the virtual resource** to at least one available
> wireless network interface, at least one **object in the virtual resource**
> being assigned to a different available wireless network interface than
> another **object in the virtual resource**; and transmitting an outgoing

request for each **object in the virtual resource**, wherein each outgoing request specifies the available wireless network interface assigned to the corresponding **object in the virtual resource**, and wherein the **objects in the virtual resource** are requested via a plurality of the available wireless network interfaces." (emphasis added)

Independent **claim 23** has been similarly amended; **the scope of claims 10 and 23 remains unchanged.**

As pointed out by the Examiner, Chebrolu, on the other hand, referring to an Interface Selector Algorithm, provides:

> "Once it is <u>decided as to which interfaces to use</u>, the interfaces that are not already up and brought up and the home agent is informed of the new changes so that it <u>can schedule packets accordingly</u>."
> (Chebrolu, pg. 2, left column, lines 28-31; emphasis added.)

As such, Chebrulo teaches that interfaces are selected by the Interface Selector Algorithm for the scheduling of packets. Further, with respect to a Scheduling Algorithm, Chebrolu goes on to provide:

> "The scheduling algorithm needs to <u>partition the traffic</u> from multiple input queues (corresponding to each application) <u>onto multiple output links (corresponding to each interface)</u>." (Chebrolu, pg. 2, right column, lines 2-4; emphasis added.)

As such, Chebrolu again teaches that packets that make up traffic from applications are scheduled for particular interfaces. Further, Chebrolu defines "packets" as data packets such as those commonly sent over networks using conventional transport protocols such as the Internet Protocol ("IP") (see Chebrolu, Introduction, paragraph 2).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Chebrolu's "packets" are not the same as Applicants' "objects in a virtual resource". Even if, in arguendo, Applicants objects were considered to be Chebrolu's "packets", Chebrolu still does not teach, "transmitting an outgoing request for each [packet], wherein each outgoing request specifies the available wireless network interface assigned to the corresponding [packet], and wherein the [packets] are requested via a plurality of the available wireless network interfaces."

In general, Chebrolu teaches selecting a wireless interface for scheduling data packets from an application. Chebrolu does not teach, disclose, or suggest Applicants' claimed, "transmitting an outgoing request for each object in the virtual resource, wherein each outgoing request specifies the available wireless network interface assigned to the corresponding object in the virtual resource, and wherein the objects in the virtual resource are requested via a plurality of the available wireless network interfaces."

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that independent **claims 10 and 23** are not unpatentable over Viswanath, even in view of Chebrolu, Rodrigues, Greer, Boehm, Nelson, Rodriguez, and/or Holder. As such, the Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

Claims 11-22, 24, 26-33, and 35 are dependent on either claim 10 or 23. As such, claims 11-22, 24, 26-33, and 35 are believed allowable based at least in part upon claim 10 or 35.

Request for Reconsideration

Accordingly, reconsideration and examination of the above-referenced application is requested.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: _September 10, 2008_____   By: _____/L. Alan Collins/_____

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

September 10, 2008_____   /Noemi Tovar/_____
Date   Noemi Tovar